IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE THIRTIETH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI DEVINDER GUPTA,THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B.SESHASAYANA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO : 11149 of 2000

Between:

S.Chandrasekhar Reddy, S/o. Ranga Reddy,
H.No. 6-3-609/1412A, Anandhanagar Colony, Khairthabad,
Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 Government of Andhra Pradesh, Rep by its Secretary, Legislative Affairs and Justice, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2 The Registrar (Vigilance) High Court of Andhra Pradesh,
Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction esepcially one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring that the G.O.Ms.No. 96, Law (LA &J Courts.C) Department dt. 9.6.1999 as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India and grant all consequential benefits like promotion and arrears of salary etc., pass such order or further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.M.SURENDER RAO

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: GP FOR HOME

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: Smt.M.Bhasjara Lakshmi, SC for High Court.

The Court made the following :

ORDER : (Per B.Seshasayana Reddy, J)

1. The writ petitioner questions the order of dismissal from service and seeks a writ of mandamus declaring G.O.Ms. No.96, Law (LA & J Courts.C) Department dated 9.6.1999 as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Articles 14, 16, 21 of the Constitution of India and grant all consequential benefits like promotion, arrears of salaries etc. and pass such order or further orders as may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

2. The writ petitioner-S.Chandrasekhar Reddy joined in judicial service as District Munsif on 16.8.1976. He was promoted as Subordinate Judge and joined as such on 15.6.1984. He worked as Subordinate Judge, Jangaon, Warangal district from July, 1995 to October, 1996. He was transferred to Nagarkurnool, Mahaboobnagar District in October, 1996. P.W.1 S.Ravinder Reddy sent a complaint petition against him alleging demand of bribe while working as Senior Civil Judge, Jangaon to pass orders favourable to the plaintiffs in a civil suit-O.S.No.21 of 1994. The said complaint was considered and sworn statement of the complainant was recorded. The High Court upon considering the complaint petition and also the sworn statement of the complainant and the material produced by him in support of the allegations against the petitioner decided to initiate disciplinary action against him. Sri Justice T.Ch.Surya Rao, the then Director of A.P. Judicial Academy, Secunderabad was appointed as Enquiry Officer. Pending the said enquiry the petitioner was placed under suspension in public interest and proceedings were accordingly issued on 21.12.1996.

3. The enquiry officer framed 12 charges against the petitioner. The first charge relates to discussions about the suit O.S.21 of 1994 pending on the file of Sub-Court, Jangaon with P.W.1 pertaining to his sister, niece and nephew while traveling in Manuguru passenger train from Khairatabad to Jangaon on 26.2.96 and asking him to meet on coming Saturday at 5.30 P.M. The second charge relates to taking hand loan of Rs.30,000/- from P.W.1 who was persuing a case in O.S.No.21/94 on behalf of his sister, niece and nephew. Thirdly, for demanding Peter Whisky bottles from P.W.1 on assurance of doing favour to him in a case relating to his sister by appointing a Receiver. The fourth charge relates to demanding liquor bottles and Rs.10,000/- as bribe from P.W.1 to do favour in his sister's case. The fifth charge relates to indenting P.W.1 to supply 12 bottles of liquor in connection with the birthday function of his daughter, which indent P.W.1 fulfilled. The sixth charge relates to illegal demand of Rs.10,000/- besides two Royal Challenge whisky bottles on Ugadi Day from P.W.1 which demands were complied with by P.W.1. The seventh charge relates to receiving Rs.1,500/- out of Rs.2,000/- allowed to the Commissioner towards his fees. The eighth charge is demanding P.W.1 to bring liquor bottles and chastising him when he expressed his inability to comply because of admission of his father in NIMS. The ninth charge relates to discussion with regard to the dismissal of the petition filed in O.S.No.21 of 1994 with P.W.1 over phone on 28.4.96 and assuring him that he would do favour in appointing receiver. The tenth charge relates to the demand of Rs.10,000/- from P.W.1 for which P.W.1 paid Rs.9,500/- apart from supplying two bottles of whisky. The eleventh charge relates to accepting bribes viz. Rs.2,00,000/- from Ramireddy who is brother-in-law of P.W.1 through his counsel Mr.John Reddy; Rs.1,000/- from Dashwanth Reddy, an Advocate of Jangaon bar and Rs.35,000/- from Ananth Reddy and that the said Ananta Reddy arranged bribe amounts to the tune of Rs.1,30,000/- from various parties like Janata Hotel, Ajanta Hotel etc. and Rs.1,00,000/- from G.P. Reddy from Jaya Bar. The twelfth charge relates to receiving bribe of Rs.2,50,000/- in land acquisition O.Ps for enhancing the compensation from Rs.5/- per square yard to Rs.47/-; and Rs.5,000/- from Neeli Anantaiah for passing a decree in his favour in a promissory note. One additional charge was also framed and indicated the same to him along with Form No.1. The additional charge relates

to shifting his residence from Nagarkurnool without obtaining prior permission of the High Court.

4. The writ petitioner filed his written statement on 1.8.97. The sum and substance of the written statement is:- he denies any acquaintance with P.W.1 and so also borrowing Rs.30,000/- on 26.2.96 and receiving Rs.10,000/- and Rs.9,500/- subsequently on two different occasions and various liquor bottles time and again on every Sunday or festival day promising to help the complainant in O.S.21/94 by appointing a Commissioner and a Receiver. He also denies of taking various amounts as bribe in various matters including an amount of Rs.2.00 lacs from brother in law of the complainant by name Ramreddy through his counsel – Jana Reddy.

5. During the enquiry 8 witnesses were examined and 7 documents were marked and 2 material objects were exhibited on behalf of the department. The petitioner besides examining himself as DW.2 examined one D.Ramesh Kumar, Station Superintendent, Jangaon Railway Station as DW.1. The enquiry officer on appreciation of the evidence, oral and documentary, brought on record, found the petitioner guilty of charges 1 to 6, 8 and 10 and additional charge while exonerating him from charges 7, 11 and 12 and submitted his report accordingly. The High Court upon considering the enquiry report and the entire record of the enquiry supplied a copy of the said report on 22.8.98 to the petitioner requiring him to submit his comments and explanations on the findings of the enquiry officer. The petitioner submitted his explanation on 21.9.98. The High Court on considering the explanation of the petitioner, the enquiry report and the entire record of the enquiry deemed it fit and expedient to dismiss the petitioner from service and accordingly recommended to the Governor to impose upon the petitioner the punishment of dismissal from service. The recommendation made by the High Court was accepted by the Governor and the Government accordingly issued the impugned G.O. dt.9.6.99 dismissing the petitioner from service and the said orders were served on him on 23.6.99. Thus, the writ petitioner before us challenging the order of dismissal from service.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner submits that the findings recorded by the enquiry officer were based on mere conjectures and surmises and they were perverse and thus the order of dismissal based on the said findings was not legal and proper and the same is liable to be set aside. He further submits that the genesis of the acquaintance between the petitioner and P.W.1 commenced from 26.2.96, which acquaintance was proved to be false by DW.1 and in such situation the subsequent events alleged to have been transpired between P.W.1 and the petitioner were liable to be rejected. He took us to the evidence of the witnesses examined during the enquiry in extentio. The tenor of his argument indicates us to re-appreciate the entire evidence and come to the conclusion other than to that of the enquiry officer. In our view such re-appreciation of the entire evidence is impermissible in a writ petition where under challenge was to the action of the disciplinary authority.

7. Learned Standing Counsel for R2 submits that the evidence of P.W.1is fully corroborated by P.W.7 and Exs.A2 to A4 cassettes and thus the enquiry officer is justified in finding the writ petitioner guilty of charges 1 to 6, 8 to 10. It is also submitted by her that the writ petitioner while being examined as DW.2 did not dispute of conversion appearing in Exs.A2 to A4 cassettes and the learned enquiry officer is justified in the circumstances of the case to take note of it while drawing the conclusion on various charges against the writ petitioner. Her further contention is that the enquiry was held inconsonance with the principles of natural justice and that during the course of enquiry full opportunity was given to the writ petitioner to defend himself and thus the enquiry proceedings do not suffer from any infirmity and in which case the findings arrived at by the enquiry officer cannot be faulted.

8. The High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution would not interfere with the findings recorded in the departmental enquiry by the disciplinary authority or the Enquiry Officer as a matter of course. The Court cannot sit in appeal over those findings and assume the role of the Appellate Authority. But this does not mean that in no circumstance can the Court interfere. The power of judicial review available to the High Court as also to this Court under the Constitution takes in its stride the domestic enquiry as well and it can interfere with the conclusions reached therein if there was no evidence to support the findings or the findings recorded were such as could not have been reached by an ordinary prudent man or the findings were

perverse or made at the dictate of the superior authority.

9. In NAND KISHORE v. STATE OF BIHAR it was held that the disciplinary proceedings before a domestic Tribunal are of quasi-judicial character and, therefore, it is necessary that the Tribunal should arrive at its conclusions on the basis of some evidence, that is to say, such evidence which, and, that too, with some degree of definiteness, points to the guilt of the delinquent and does not leave the matter in a suspicious state as mere suspicion cannot take the place of proof even in domestic enquiries. If, therefore, there is no evidence to sustain the charges framed against the delinquent, he cannot be held to be guilty as in that event, the findings recorded by the Enquiry Officer would be perverse.

10. The findings, recorded in a domestic enquiry, can be characterized as perverse if it is shown that such a finding is not supported by any evidence on record or is not based on the evidence adduced by the parties or no reasonable person could have come to those findings on the basis of that evidence. This principle was laid down by the Apex Court in STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH v. SREE RAMA RAO in which the question was whether the High Court, under Article 226 could interfere with the findings recorded at the departmental enquiry. This decision was followed in CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA V. PRAKASH CHAND JAIN and BHARAT IRON WORKS V. BHAGUBHAI BALUBHAI PATEL. In RAJINDER KUMAR KINDRA V. DELHI ADMINISTRATION THROUGH SECRETARY (LABOUR) it was laid down that where the findings of misconduct are based on no legal evidence and the conclusion is one to which no reasonable man could come, the findings can be rejected as perverse. It was also laid down that where a quasi judicial Tribunal records findings based on no legal evidence and the findings are his mere ipse dixit or based on conjectures and surmises, the enquiry suffers from the additional infirmity of non-application of mind and stands vitiated.

11. In KULDEEP SINGH v. COMMISSIONER OF POLICE the Supreme Court has held that normally the High Court and this Court would not interfere with the

findings of fact recorded at the domestic enquiry but if the finding of "guilt" is based on no evidence, it would be a perverse finding and would be amenable to judicial scrutiny. A broad distinction has, therefore, to be maintained between the decisions which are perverse and those which are not. If a decision is arrived at on no evidence or evidence which is thoroughly unreliable and no reasonable person would act upon it, the order would be perverse. But if there is some evidence on record which is acceptable and which could be relied upon, howsoever compendious it may be, the conclusions would not be treated as perverse and the findings would not be interfered with.

12. In the light of the above principles let us scrutinize the case on hand. The charges leveled against the petitioner have been detailed in the aforesaid paragraphs of the judgment. The accusations made against the petitioner are that he borrowed Rs.30,000/- from P.W.1 on the assurance that he would help him in a case pending before him relating to sister of P.W.1 and that he also accepted illegal gratifications in the form of cash once Rs.10,000/- and Rs.9,500/- on another occasion liquor bottles once in a week commencing from first week of March for a period of three months. He shifted his residence from Nagarkurnool to Hyderabad during his suspension without the permission of High Court. The department examined 8 witnesses and proved 7 documents and exhibited 2 Mos. The defence of the petitioner is that on 26.2.1996 he did not travel in Munugur passenger train and that he had no acquaintance with P.W.1 and he never had any conversion over telephone or in person with either P.W.1 or his wife-P.W.7. His further defence is that on 28.4.96 he got admitted in NIMS for his heart ailment and took treatment for two days and therefore he had no occasion to enter into conversation with any one much less P.W.1 on that day. In order to probablize his defence he got himself examined as DW.2 besides examining the Station Superintendent, Jangaon Railway Station, (D.Ramesh Kumar) as DW.1 and marked Exs.B.1 to B.12. The petitioner while being examined as DW.2 swears on two aspects. The first one is with regard to his admission in the hospital and the second one is with regard to the timings of arrival of Munuguru passenger train to Jangaon Railway station on 26.2.96. For better appreciation we may refer the evidence of DW.2 in his own words and it is thus:

" I worked as Subordiante Judge, Jangaon from July 1995 till the end of

October 1996. On 27th April, 1996 after summer vacation after attending the District Judicial Officers Conference and, presided by Hon'ble Ms. Justice S.V. Maruthi, at Warangal. I came to Hyderabad by the Express Bus about 10.00 p.m. in the night. On the same day night at early hours i.e. on 28.4.96 I suffered an acute chest pain. In the early morning therefore I along with my wife went to NIMS Hospital, Hyderabad. After preliminary examination I was admitted into the intensive care unit in the said Hospital. I had undergone treatment in that Hospital till 29th evening, and I was discharged from the Hospital on 29.4.1996 evening. Dr.Srinivas, the incharge Cardiologist, attended on me during that period. Ex.B.1 is the OP card of the Nizams Hospital issued to me. Ex.B2 is ECHO report dt.28.4.96 taken at the NIMS hospital. Ex.B3 is the ECG report taken on 28.4.1996 at Nizams Hospital. Ex.B4 is the ECG report taken by the Nizams Hospital on 29.4.1996. Ex.B5 is the Cardiology I.P. Registration ticket, dated 28.4.96. Ex.B6 is the Discharge Summary ticket, dated 29.4.1996, issued by the NIMS hospital. Ex.B7 is the Bill given for Stress test and Ex.B8 is the Bill for the Treadmill Test given at Nizams Hospital on 11.5.96. Ex.B.9 is the Xerox true copy of the Reimbursement Bill. Ex.B10 is the Trust Extract of the dairy of the sub-Court of Jangaon, dt.26.2.96, showing the entries of the proceedings made on 26.2.96. I attended the Court on 26.2.96 at 10.30 a.m. I have not applied for any permission to leave the headquarters on 25.2.96. Ex.B.11 is the letter addressed to me by the Subordiante Judge, Jangaon where under the Xerox true copies have been supplied to me at my request.

Cross-Examination: -

It is not true to suggest that I spoke to P.W.1 on 28.4.96. It is not true to suggest that I admitted into Intensive Care Unit at 5.25 p.m. on 28.4.96. I was admitted into the Hospital at 8.40 a.m. the witness volunteer. It is not true to suggest the time mentioned on the left corner on the top of Ex.B1 has been subsequently introduced for the purpose of the enquiry."

It is crystal clear from his evidence that he did not speak a word about the cassettes which have been exhibited as Exs.A2 to A4, which cassettes, according to the department, contain the conversation between the petitioner and P.W.1 and also between the petitioner and the wife of P.W.1. The copies of the cassettes were furnished to the petitioner prior to commencement of recording the evidence in the enquiry, and the contents of the cassettes were spoken to by P.W.1 and P.W.7 and were replayed during their evidence in the presence of the petitioner. It is suggested

by the petitioner to P.W.1 and P.W.7 that they manipulated his voice with the assistance of mimicry artist. Since the petitioner himself cross-examined P.W.1 and P.W.7, the learned Enquiry Officer got the cross-examination of P.W.1 and P.W.7 tape recorded openly and compared the voice of the petitioner. Ex.P.6 is the audio cassette recorded at the time of cross-examination and Ex.A7 is the audio cassette recorded at the time of cross-examination of P.W.7. The Enquiry officer compared the voice of the petitioner recorded in Exs.A6 and A7 with the voice of the person with whom P.W.1 and P.W.7 conversed in Exs.A2 to A4 cassettes and found that the voice in both the sets of cassettes are identical. It is apposite to refer the findings recorded by the Enquiry officer on this aspect and it is thus:

" It has been suggested to P.W.1 in the cross-examination while denying the conversation between P.W.1 and DW.1 that the tapes have been created with the assistance of a person who knows mimicry. In a way it suggests that the voice in the tape is similar to the voice of DW.2, since it is said that the tape has been created with the assistance of a mimicry artist. Ex.A2 to A4 cassettes contain the conversation which lasts long. If the conversation is short there would have been some reason in the said contention of the charged officer. When it is a free conversation between two persons which lasts for quite a long time, it is difficult even for the ventriloquist to imitate the voice for such a long time freely. DW.2 in his evidence in ordinary course should have denied his voice in Ex.A2 to A4 upon oath. Curiously he has omitted to do so even when he has chosen to examine himself as a witness. Added to it there is the evidence of P.W.7. P.W.7 in her evidence identified her voice and also the voice of the charged officer. Even to her it has been suggested in the cross-examination that the voice of the charged officer has been created with the help of a mimicry artist and that she is giving false evidence at the instance of her husband. Although P.W.7 being the wife of P.W.1 can be said to be interested that itself is not sufficient to eschew her evidence. The career of a judicial officer has been involved in this enquiry. P.W.7 would have shuddered ordinarily to speak utter falsehood upon oath even at the instance of her husband as against a judicial officer. Her evidence is quite natural and inspires every confidence. I do not see any compelling reason to disbelieve the testimony of P.W.7. Further more DW.2 in his evidence did not deny this fact on oath. For these reasons, I have no hesitation to accept the evidence of P.W.7. The evidence of P.W.7 corroborates the evidence of P.W.1 in identifying the voice of the charged officer. The voice of the charged officer has been recorded during the course of enquiry openly to his knowledge when he has been cross-examining P.Ws.1 and 7. This fact has been proved by the evidence of P.W.8, the steno-typist, whose evidence remained

> uncontroverted. Now those tapes have been marked in this case as Exs.A6 and A7 and they do contain the voice of the charged officer obviously. The voice in Exs.A6 and A7 and the voice in Exs.A2 to A4 can therefore be heard and compared, so as to see whether they tally or not. In my view they do tally. This procedure adopted in comparing the voice is in accordance with law. This further lands support to the evidence of P.W.1. Thus, the direct evidence of P.W.1 and P.W.7; the fact that DW.2 has not denied on oath the voice in Exs.A2, A3 and A4 cassettes; the suggestion that, Exs.A2, A3 and A4 have been created with the help of a ventriloquist, suggesting thereby the voice in Exs.A2, A3 and A4 is identical with the voice of the charged officer; and the circumstance that the voice in Exs.A6 and A7 is identical with the voice in Exs.A2 to A4, in my view prove that Exs.A2 to A4 cassettes do contain the voice of the charged officer."

While preparing the judgment, in order to satisfy ourselves about what is held by the Enquiry Officer we too replayed Exs.A2, A3, A4, A6 and A7 cassettes. We are fully satisfied that the voice of the person conversing with P.W.1 and P.W.7 as recorded in Exs.A2, A3 and A4 and the voice of the petitioner in the cross-examination of P.Ws.1 and P.W.7 as recorded in Exs.A6 and A7 cassettes are identical. The conversation between P.W.1 with the petitioner went for sufficiently long time. With such a long conversation it is improbable for any mimicry artist to imitate the voice of a person.

13. The other factor which need to be noted is that by the time P.W.1 presented Ex.P.5 report against the petitioner, the petitioner had been transferred from Jangaon and was working in Nagarkurnool, Mahabobnagar District. Had the petitioner not accepted any money or liquor bottles from P.W.1 on the assurance of favouring the plaintiffs in O.S.21 of 1994 there was no reason for him to file a complaint against the petitioner two months after his transfer. The petitioner was transferred from Jangaon in October, 1996 and whereas Exs.A5 report was presented by P.W.1 on 18.12.1996. P.W.1 submitted A5 report along with Ex.A1 chit containing the telephone number and the name of the petitioner and the cassettes (Ex.sA2 to A4) containing the conversion between him and the petitioner and also the conversation between his wife-P.W.7 and the petitioner. The evidence of P.W.1 is cogent and convincing and there is no reason to disbelieve his testimony. P.W.7

is the wife of P.W.1 and she corroborates the testimony of P.W.1 in all material particulars. Their testimony is amply supported by contents of A2 to A4 cassettes. The Enquiry officer considered the evidence brought on record extensively and recorded a finding against the petitioner on charges 1 to 6 and 8 to 10. With regard to additional charge it is an undisputed fact that the petitioner shifted his residence without obtaining consent from the Department. The learned Enquiry Officer has taken note of it and recorded a finding that the petitioner is guilty of the additional charge.

14. Much emphasis has been made by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner commenced the proceedings in court on 26.2.1996 by 10.30 A.M. and since the Manuguru train arrived Jangaon on that day at 12.02 p.m., the genesis of the acquaintance which P.W.1 claims with the petitioner while traveling in Manuguru passenger train to attend the court falls to the ground. The same contention was raised before the Enquiry officer. The Enquiry Officer on thorough examination of the material brought on record did not find any substance in his contention. The findings recorded by the Enquiry Officer reads as follows:

" DW.1 the Station Superintendent of Jangaon deposed with reference to TSR maintained in his station that the Manuguru passenger usually starts at Hyderabad at 7.50 a.m. and arrives at Jangaon by 10.58 a.m. and that as per the TSR the said train arrived at Jangaon from Hyderabad at 12.02 p.m. on 26.2.1996. This evidence of DW.1 remains uncontroverted and therefore can be accepted without any hesitation. Ex.B.10 is the true extract of the diary which shows the proceedings in the court were commenced at 10.30 a.m. on 26.2.1996. P.W.1 in the cross-examination admitted that at 10.30 a.m. on 26.2.1996, the officer was present in the court. It is to be seen to what extent this oral and documentary evidence will tilt the scales. P.W.1 did not say any evidence about the time at which he had boarded the train and the time at which it reached Jangaon on 26.2.1996. The entries will be made in the diary usually showing the commencement of the proceedings, at 10.30 a.m. giving allowance to short delays and those entries may not reflect, therefore the correct state of affairs. Unless they are proved by other supporting evidence, the timings mentioned therein cannot be taken as accurate. Although these entries require much importance to be attached, given the principles of evidence and presumptions, we cannot ignore in this departmental enquiry certain practical realities. Therefore, no arithmetical precision can ultimately be attached to these timings.

> The admission made by P.W.1 referred to above under the stress of cross-examination cannot therefore be taken as conclusive proof. The testimony of P.W.1 shall have to be considered in the light of other circumstances. The question is whether the charged officer (DW.2) traveled in Manuguru Passenger train from Hyderabad to Jangaon on 26.2.1996.This evidence of DW.1 and the so called admission made by P.W.1 will not rule out the possibility of DW.2 traveling in the Manuguru Passenger train. Even assuming for a moment that DW.2 did not travel in Manuguru Passenger on 26.2.1996, the acquaintance between P.W.1 and D.W.2 if any and their conversation time to time said to have taken place between them which could be shown to be true by any other means cannot be ruled out as false."

As noticed above the Enquiry officer has given cogent and convincing reasons for not giving much importance to the date of commencement of proceedings on 26.2.1996. We have seen the true extract of proceedings marked as Ex.B.10. On 26.2.96 no witness was examined. No exhibit was marked. Time of commencement of the proceedings on criminal side has been noted as 10.30 A.M. and so also the commencement of proceedings on civil side has been noted as 10.30 A.M. Apparently, the commencement of the proceedings on civil side and criminal side cannot be at the same time. No case was heard either criminal or civil. Only one case was disposed of i.e. I.A.311 OF 1995 in O.S.14 of 1995. The application which came to be allowed on that day was consequent to the respondent not filing counter and there being no representation on his behalf. The relevant entry relating to that I.A. reads as follows:

> " I.A.311/95 IN o.s.14/95. Counter not filed. Respondents called absent. No representation is made. No ground to adjourn. Hence, petition allowed."

In these circumstances, the Enquiry Officer is justified in not giving any importance to the time of commencement of court proceedings as entered in Ex.B.10 diary of Sub-court, Jangaon. The High Court after going through the record microscopically accepted the findings recorded by the Enquiry Officer and recommended for dismissal of the petitioner, which recommendation came to be accepted by the Government. We do not see any reason to interfere with the findings recorded by the Enquiry Officer and accepted by the Department. The petitioner failed to make out any ground to interfere with the order impugned in the writ petition.

15. Accordingly, this Writ Petition fails and the same is dismissed.

Tnb

Dated: 30-03-2005. (DEVINDER GUPTA, CJ)

(B.SESHASAYANA REDDY, J)

To

1. Two copies to Standing Counsel for Home, Government of A.P., High Court Buildings, Hyderabad.
2. Two copies to Smt.M.Bhaskara Lakshmi, S.C. for High Court of A.P., High Court buildings, Hyderabad.

3) 2 CD copies